REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 1, 3 through 5, 9, and 14 are pending, with Claim 1 being independent. Claims 1 and 3 have been amended. In particular, "0.5" has been changed to --1.5--, which is the number set forth in the Example at page 31, line 16, and for which favorable consideration is earnestly solicited.

All claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. Patent No. 6,203,899 B1 (Hirose, et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,502,935 B1 (Barcock, et al.). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, (A) has an average particle size of not larger than 0.5 μm and (B) has an average particle size ranging from 1.5 μm to 10 μm.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Hirose, et al. nor Barcock, et al., even in the proposed combinations, assuming, *arguendo*, that such could be combined, discloses or suggests at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, *inter alia*, in Claim 1.

The Official Action notes that Hirose, et al. is silent as to such features, and therefore relies upon Barcock, et al. This reliance is respectfully traversed.

First, Applicant respectfully submits that in the Examples of Barcock et al., the barium sulfate, which corresponds to pigment (B) of the present invention, has an average particle size of 0.7 μm to 1.20 μm; while the aluminum oxide, which corresponds to pigment (A) of the present invention, has an average particle size of 1.45 μm, and silica has an average particle size of 3 μm to 5 μm — thus, the relationship in the Examples of Barcock, et al. is *opposite* that of the present invention.

Second, turning to the remainder of Barcock, et al., that document mentions that the aluminum oxide, which corresponds to pigment (A) of the present invention, preferably has an average particle size ranging from 0.7 to 5.0 μm, and that the barium sulfate, which corresponds to pigment (B) of the present invention, preferably has an average particle size ranging from 0.2 to 2.0 μm, i.e., there is an overlapped range of 0.7 to 2.0 μm. However, Applicant respectfully submits that such provides neither a description nor a suggestion of at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, *inter alia*, in Claim 1.

Applicant also respectfully submits that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in the cited documents that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at such features. In this regard, Applicant submits that the present inventor noticed the technical problem that single use of the pigment (B) may produce adverse effects of swelling of the base material and waving of the recording medium owing to the less liquid-absorbency (solvent retaining property) of the pigment (B) and resulting in penetration of the solvent into the fibrous base material; in order to solve this problem with the present invention, pigment (A) having an average particle size smaller than that of pigment (B) is used, so that pigment (A), which is present between pigment (B) particles, causes swelling to hold the solvent and to retain the shape of the reflecting layer; on the other hand, if pigment (A) is larger than pigment (B), the pigment (A) itself which has absorbed the solvent will swell, failing to bring about the meritorious effect of suppressing decrease in smoothness of the recording surface even after receiving ink; therefore, the pigment particle size is an important factor for the meritorious effect of the present invention; whereas, Applicant submits that, in contrast, neither of the cited documents mentions anything about the waviness of a recording medium caused after printing or the particle size

relationship of the constituent pigments of the light-reflecting layer, let alone discloses or suggests the claimed invention; Applicant submits that, in other words, the meritorious effect of the present invention that the waving after printing can be suppressed with the relationship of pigments (A) and (B) according to the present invention could not easily be expected from the cited prior art, and hence is an unexpected result.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from independent claims discussed above. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel S. Glueck/
Daniel S. Glueck
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 37,838

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

DSG/cmg

DC_MAIN 266200v1